

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 2088-02  
Bill No.: HCS for HB 976  
Subject: Children and Minors; Health Care  
Type: Original  
Date: April 2, 2015

---

Bill Summary: This proposal changes the laws regarding the protection of children.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 5 pages.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018
<b>Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

☐ Estimated Net Effect (expenditures or reduced revenues) expected to exceed \$100,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act.

<b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS</b>			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018
<b>Local Government</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

## FISCAL ANALYSIS

### ASSUMPTION

In response to one of the proposals incorporated into this substitute (HB 1045), **Oversight** previously responded that it was unable to receive some of the agency responses due to the short fiscal note request time. Oversight assumed the proposal would have no fiscal impact on the state or local governments.

Officials from the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**, the **Department of Health and Senior Services**, the **Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration**, the **Department of Mental Health**, the **Department of Social Services**, the **Joint Committee on Administrative Rules**, the **Office of State Courts Administrator**, **Callaway County** and **St. Louis County** each assume the proposal would not fiscally impact their respective agencies.

Officials from the **Office of the Secretary of State (SOS)** state many bills considered by the General Assembly include provisions allowing or requiring agencies to submit rules and regulations to implement the act. The SOS is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of normal activity resulting from each year's legislative session. The fiscal impact for this fiscal note to the SOS for Administrative Rules is less than \$2,500. The SOS recognizes that this is a small amount and does not expect that additional funding would be required to meet these costs. However, the SOS also recognizes that many such bills may be passed by the General Assembly in a given year and that collectively the costs may be in excess of what the office can sustain with the core budget. Therefore, the SOS reserves the right to request funding for the cost of supporting administrative rules requirements should the need arise based on a review of the finally approved bills signed by the governor.

**Oversight** assumes the SOS could absorb the costs of printing and distributing regulations related to this proposal. If multiple bills pass which require the printing and distribution of regulations at substantial costs, the SOS could request funding through the appropriation process.

Officials from the **St. Louis City Treasurer's Office**, the **St. Louis City Circuit Clerk's Office** and the **Phelps County Circuit Clerk's Office** did not respond to **Oversight's** request for a statement of fiscal impact.

Officials from the following **counties**: Andrew, Atchison, Audrain, Barry, Bollinger, Boone, Buchanan, Camden, Cape Girardeau, Carroll, Cass, Clay, Cole, Cooper, DeKalb, Dent, Franklin, Greene, Holt, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Knox, Laclede, Lawrence, Lincoln, Marion, McDonald, Miller, Moniteau, Monroe, Montgomery, New Madrid, Nodaway, Ozark, Perry, Pettis, Platte, Pulaski, Scott, Shelby, St. Charles, St. Francois, Taney, Warren, Wayne and Worth did not respond to **Oversight's** request for a statement of fiscal impact.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

Small business child care facilities could be impacted by this proposal.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION


The proposed legislation appears to have no direct fiscal impact.

This proposal has an emergency clause.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education  
Department of Health and Senior Services  
Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration  
Department of Mental Health  
Department of Social Services  
Joint Committee on Administrative Rules  
Office of State Courts Administrator  
Office of Secretary of State  
Callaway County  
St. Louis County



Mickey Wilson, CPA  
Director  
April 2, 2015

Ross Strobe  
Assistant Director  
April 2, 2015